

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CNB 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH(CABN 163973)
Chief, Criminal Division

OWEN P. MARTIKAN (CSBN 177104)
Assistant United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055
San Francisco, California 94102-3495
Telephone: (415) 436-7241
FAX: (415) 436- 7234
owen.martikan@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JASON HOANG, YANG CAO, and YANG
HUA MEI,

Defendants.

No. CR 08-0238 MHP

**STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JULY
7, 2008 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 8, 2008**

On July 7, 2008, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status conference. The parties stipulated and the Court agreed that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from July 7, 2008, through September 8, 2008, for effective preparation of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best interests of the public

//

STIP & [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CR 08-0238 MHP

FILED

AUG 07 2008

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1 and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

2 SO STIPULATED:

3 JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
4 United States Attorney

5 DATED: August 5, 2008

6 /s/ Owen Martikan
OWEN P. MARTIKAN
Assistant United States Attorney

7
8 DATED: July 31, 2008

BARRY J. PORTMAN

9
10
11
12 DATED: August 4, 2008

13 /s/
RONALD C. TYLER
Attorney for Jason Hoang

14
15 DATED: August 1, 2008

16 /s/
DAVID J. COHEN
Attorney for Yang Cao

17 As the Court found on July 7, 2008, and for the reasons stated above, an exclusion of time
18 from July 7, 2008, through September 8, 2008, is warranted because the ends of justice served by
19 the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See*
20 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense
21 counsel the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise
22 of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

23 SO ORDERED.

24
25
26 DATED: 8/7/08

27 
HON. MARILYN HALL PATEL
United States District Judge